



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

mm
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/719,588

11/21/2003

Achim Ansmann

C 2586 COGG

3271

23657

7590

12/11/2007

COGNIS CORPORATION
PATENT DEPARTMENT
300 BROOKSIDE AVENUE
AMBLER, PA 19002

EXAMINER

KANTAMNENI, SHOBHA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1617

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/11/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/719,588	Applicant(s) ANSMANN ET AL.	
	Examiner Shobha Kantamneni	Art Unit 1617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 September 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 13-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) NONE is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 13-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's amendment filed on 09/17/2007, wherein claims 1-5 have been amended, and new claims 13-17 have been added. Applicant's amendment also cancelled claims 10-12.

Applicant's amendment overcomes the rejection of claims 1, 4-5, 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kamifukuoka et al. (US 5,344,582, PTO-892).

Applicant's amendment overcomes the rejection of claims 1, 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Monsanto company (US 1,303,773, PTO-1449).

Applicant's amendment overcomes the rejection of claims 2-3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Monsanto company.

Claims 1-5, 13-17 are examined herein.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Art Unit: 1617

Applicant's amendment with respect to new claims 16-17 has been fully considered but is deemed to insert new matter into the claims, since the specification as originally filed does not provide support for the limitation, "wherein the amount of the compound of formula (I) in the pharmaceutical composition is from 0.1 % to 50 % by weight", and "wherein the amount of the compound of formula(I) in the pharmaceutical composition is from 0.1 % to 30 % by weight". The original specification merely discloses that the dicyclic compounds are suitable for use in pharmaceutical preparations. See page 3, lines 19-20. Accordingly, the claimed subject matter has not been described in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors at the time the application was filed were actually in possession of such as pharmaceutical composition having the particular amounts, and thus the claim fails to meet the written description

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Garland et al. (Journal of the American Chemical Society, Sept, 1925, pages 2333-2340, PTO-1449).

Art Unit: 1617

Garland et al. disclose composition comprising 1-methyl-2-cyclohexyl-cyclohexane, and 1-ethyl-2-cyclohexyl-cyclohexane, which read on instantly claimed compounds of formula (I) as in instant claim 1. See page 2339, TABLE V; page 2340 line 1.

Regarding the recitations "wherein the compound is incorporated into a cosmetic preparation", "wherein the compound is incorporated into a pharmaceutical preparation", it is pointed out that the recitations of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

Thus, Garland et al. anticipates instant claims 1, 13.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-5, and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garland et al., and in view of Luisi (WO 8900077, PTO-1449).

Garland et al. disclose composition comprising 1-methyl-2-cyclohexyl-cyclohexane, and 1-ethyl-2-cyclohexyl-cyclohexane, which read on instantly claimed

Art Unit: 1617

compounds of formula (I) as in instant claim 1. See page 2339, TABLE V; page 2340 line 1.

Garland et al. does not teach the particular compound of formula (III), or formula (IV) as in claims 2-3, and 14-15, and the employment of the compound of formula (III) or formula (IV) in a cosmetic and pharmaceutical composition.

Garland et al. do not teach the amounts of bicyclohexyl compounds in the compositions therein as 0.1 % to 50 % by weight.

Luisi teaches that bicyclohexyl compounds are employed in pharmaceutical preparations as solvents. See page 9; page 17, claim 5.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to the particular instant compound of formula (III) or (IV) in the prior art composition of Luisi because Luisi teaches that cycloalkanes which include bicyclohexyl compounds, cyclopentane are known to be useful as solvents in pharmaceutical preparation.

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been reasonably expected that the instant particular compound of formula (III), or (IV), would have same or substantially similar usefulness as solvents in pharmaceutical preparation, based on the reasonable expectation that structurally similar species usually have similar properties. See, e.g., Dillon, 919 F.2d at 693, 696, 16 USPQ2d at 1901, 1904. See also Deuel, 51 F.3d at 1558, 34 USPQ2d at 1214, and if the claimed invention and the structurally similar prior art species share any useful property, that will generally be sufficient to motivate an artisan of ordinary skill to make the claimed species. In fact, similar

Art Unit: 1617

properties may normally be presumed when compounds are very close in structure.

Dillon, 919 F.2d at 693, 696, 16 USPQ2d at 1901, 1904, as noted in MPEP 2144.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to determine or optimize parameters such as effective amounts of the bicyclohexyl compounds employed in the composition of Garland et al. to obtain a pharmaceutical composition, a cosmetic composition, since Luisi teaches that bicyclohexyl compounds are known to be used as solvents in pharmaceutical composition.

One having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to determine the effective amounts of bicyclohexyl compounds employed in the compositions, since the optimization of effective amounts of known agents, is considered well in the competence level of an ordinary skilled artisan in cosmetic and pharmaceutical science, involving merely routine skill in the art.

It has been held that it is within the skill in the art to select optimal parameters, such as amounts of ingredients, in a composition in order to achieve a beneficial effect. See *In re Boesch*, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period, will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shobha Kantamneni whose telephone number is 571-272-2930. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Thursday, 8am-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan, Ph.D can be reached on 571-272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Shobha Kantamneni, Ph.D
Patent Examiner
Art Unit : 1617



SREENI PADMANABHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER